

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated March 23, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

Claims 1-5, 9-14, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Biederman (U.S. 7,006,526, hereinafter Biederman). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A method to set at least one computer setting comprising the steps of:

determining a largest value and a major value in a superset of values; setting the at least one computer setting to a value greater than or equal to one of the largest value and the major value; wherein the major value is a value that is greater than the values that a majority of applications use.

Nowhere does Biederman teach or suggest that the major value is a value that is greater than the values that a majority of applications use. Accordingly, claim 1 distinguishes over Biederman and is in allowable condition.

Claims 2-4 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 5 recites:

A method to negotiate an option in a computer environment comprising the steps of: predicting if the option will be needed; if the option is predicted to be needed, predicting if the option will need a value outside of a normal range of values: if the option is predicted to need the value outside of the normal range of values: determining an outside setting to use that is outside of the normal range of values; setting the value to the outside setting; if the option is not predicted to need the value outside of the normal range of values: setting the value to a normal setting within the normal range of values.

Nowhere does Biederman teach or suggest determining an outside setting to use that he is outside the normal range of values and setting the value to the outside setting if the option will need a value outside of a normal range of values. Accordingly, claim 5 distinguishes over Biederman and is in allowable condition.

Claims 6-9 depend from claim 5 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 10 as amended recites:

A computer readable medium having computer executable instructions for setting a computer setting, the computer executable instructions performing the steps comprising: obtaining a range of values used for the computer setting, the range of values including a largest value and a major value, wherein the major value is a value that is greater than the values that a majority of applications use; determining a largest value in the range of values; setting the computer setting to a value greater than or equal to the largest value.

Nowhere does Biederman teach or suggest obtaining a range of values used for the computer setting, the range of values including a largest value and a major value, wherein the major value is a value that is greater than the values that a majority of applications use. Accordingly, claim 10 distinguishes over Biederman and is in allowable condition.

Claims 11-13 depend from claim 10 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 14 recites:

A computer readable medium having computer executable instructions for negotiating an option in a computer environment, the computer executable instructions performing the steps comprising: predicting if the option will be needed; if the option is predicted to be needed: predicting if the option will need a value outside of a normal range of values: if the option is predicted to need the value outside of the normal range of values: determining an outside setting to use that is outside of the normal range of values; setting the value to the outside setting; if the option is not predicted to need the value outside of the normal range of values: setting the value to a normal setting within the normal range of values.

Nowhere does Biederman teach or suggest predicting if the option will need a value outside a normal range of values, if the option is predicted to need the value outside of the normal range of values, then determining an outside setting to use that is outside the normal range of values and setting the value to the outside setting. Accordingly, claim 14 distinguishes over Biederman and is in allowable condition.

Claims 15-18 depend from claim 14 and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Dated: September 22, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James H. Morris
Registration No.: 34,681
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
(617) 646-8000